



**DISCRIMINATION LAW:
EQUALITY IN THE PRIVATE SECTOR**

2003-2004

Volume 1

Professor Denise Réaume

Faculty of Law
University of Toronto

BORA LASKIN LAW LIBRARY

AUG 28 2003

FACULTY OF LAW
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO


DISCRIMINATION LAW:
EQUALITY IN THE PRIVATE SECTOR

2003-2004

Volume 1

Professor Denise Réaume

I am grateful to Mark Hart and Geri Sanson for permission to use some of the ideas from their revised version of these materials in use at Osgoode Hall Law School, and to Carlin McGoogan, for his invaluable research assistance.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2018 with funding from
University of Toronto

DISCRIMINATION LAW: EQUALITY IN THE PRIVATE SECTOR

2003-2004

Table of Contents

PART I: BACKGROUND

1. THE EQUALITY DEBATE

Charles Taylor, Multiculturalism and “the Politics of Recognition”	1
Iris Marion Young, Justice and the Politics of Difference	17
M.G. Crawford, “Human Rights Commissions: Politically Correct Predators?”	24

2. CANADIAN HUMAN RIGHTS LEGISLATION MODELS: Background and General Principles

A. The Origins Of Discrimination Law

R. Brian Howe and David Johnson, <i>Restraining Equality</i>	31
--	----

B. The Administrative Model of Human Rights Protection

R. Brian Howe and David Johnson, <i>Restraining Equality</i>	43
<i>Bell Canada v. Canadian Telephone Employees Association</i>	60
<i>Blencoe v. British Columbia (Human Rights Commission)</i>	68

C. The Status of Discrimination Law and Tribunals

1. Interpretive Principles Governing Discrimination Law

W. Tarnopolsky and W. Pentney, <i>Discrimination and the Law</i> ,	71
<i>C.N. v. Canada, (Action Travail des Femmes)</i>	73

2. Judicial Review of Tribunal Decisions

<i>Pezin v. British Columbia (Superintendent of Brokers)</i>	74
<i>Canada (Attorney General) v. Mossop</i>	74
David Dyzenhaus, “The Politics of Deference: Judicial Review and Democracy”	85

PART II: THE STRUCTURE OF A DISCRIMINATION COMPLAINT

3. OF PIGEONHOLES AND PRINCIPLES: THE GROUNDS AND SPHERES COVERED

Note	95
------------	----

Grounds of Discrimination:

Nitya Iyer, “Categorical Denials: Equality Rights and the Shaping of Social Identity”	96
<i>Egan v. Canada</i>	108
<i>Canada (Attorney General) v. Mossop</i>	113
<i>Vriend v. Alberta</i>	133
<i>B. v. Ontario (Human Rights Commission)</i>	141
<i>Ontario Human Rights Commission v. Vogue Shoes</i>	149
<i>Davison v. St Paul Lutheran Home of Melville, Sask.</i>	159
<i>Québec (Commission des droits) v. Boisbriand</i>	162
<i>Jubran v. Board of Trustees</i>	165
<i>Vancouver Rape Relief Society v. British Columbia</i>	168

Spheres within which Discrimination is Prohibited

<i>Gould v. Yukon Order of Pioneers</i>	174
---	-----

4. DEFINING THE WRONG

From Intention To Adverse Effect

Note	195
William Black, “From Intent to Effect: New Standards in Human Rights”	196
Beatrice Vizkelety, <i>Proving Discrimination in Canada</i>	201
<i>Griggs v. Duke Power Co.</i>	208
<i>Ontario H. R. C. & Theresa O'Malley (Vincent) v. Simpsons-Sears (S.C.C.)</i>	213
<i>C.N.R. v. Canada (Cndn H. R. C.) (Action Travail des Femmes)</i>	220

Limitations on the Rights not to be Discriminated Against

i) <i>Bona fide</i> occupations requirements	
<i>Ontario Human Rights Commission v. Borough of Etobicoke</i>	222

<i>Brossard v. Québec (Commission des droit de la personne)</i>	225
<i>Saskatchewan (Human Rights Commission) v. Saskatoon (City)</i>	234
ii) Reasonable Accommodation	
W. Tarnopolsky and W. Pentney, <i>Discrimination and the Law</i>	240
<i>Central Alberta Dairy Pool v. Alberta (Human Rights Commission)</i>	248
<i>Large v. Stratford (City)</i>	260
<i>Chambly, Commission Scolaire Régionale v. Bergevin</i>	270
<i>Howard v. University of British Columbia</i>	275
Judith Keene, <i>Human Rights in Ontario</i>	282
<i>Streamlining the Discrimination Analysis – A New Start</i>	
Shelagh Day and Gwen Brodsky, “The Duty to Accommodate: Who Will Benefit?”	286
<i>B.C. (Public Service Employee Relations Commission) v. BCGSEU</i>	308
<i>B.C. (Superintendent of Motor Vehicles) v. B.C. (Council of Human Rights)</i> .	323

